

R E M A R K S

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected the claims under 35 USC §102 and 35 USC §103. The rejections are fully traversed below. The claims have been amended to correct typographical errors and to further clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claim 39 has been cancelled. Claims 1-38 and 40-82 remain pending.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 USC §102(B)

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 44-46, 52, 67-69 and 77-79 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Inoue et al, U.S. Patent No.6,167,513, ('Inoue' hereinafter). This rejection is fully traversed below.

With respect to claim 1, Applicant respectfully asserts that Inoue fails to disclose or suggest "receiving a Mobile IP registration request packet from the Mobile Node indicating that a key to be shared by the Mobile Node and an agent with which the Mobile Node is registering is requested, wherein the agent with which the Mobile Node is registering is a Home Agent." More particularly, col. 17, lines 3-9 discloses the sending of a registration request. However, Inoue fails to disclose or suggest that the registration request indicates that a key to be shared by the Mobile Node and an agent with which the Mobile node is registering is requested, where the agent with which the Mobile Node is registering is a Home Agent.

In addition, the Examiner cites col. 13, lines 26-31 and col. 17, line 60-col. 18, line 22. Inoue does disclose a master key to be shared between two data packet encryption gateways or between the data packet encryption gateway and the mobile computer. See col. 13, lines 26-31. In addition, a key request is sent by the mobile computer to the gateway. See col. 17, lines 54-59. However, it is important to note that the gateway, shown as element 4b in FIG. 43, is not a Mobility Agent supporting Mobile IP such as a Home Agent. Rather,

the gateway is shown to be a network device between the mobile computer and the Home Agent. Moreover, the key is not shared between the Home Agent and the mobile computer, and the key request is not sent in the form of a registration request message. Stated another way, the mobile computer is not registering with the gateway. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that Inoue fails to disclose or suggest “obtaining a key to be shared by the Mobile Node and the agent with which the Mobile Node is registering” or “storing the key to be shared by the Mobile Node and the agent with which the Mobile Node is registering.”

Moreover, col. 17, lines 3-9 of Inoue disclose the sending of a registration reply message. In addition, Inoue discloses the obtaining of the public key of the gateway in response to the key request message. See col. 17, line 60 – col. 18, line 22. However, Inoue fails to disclose “sending a Mobile IP registration reply packet to the mobile node including the key to be shared by the Mobile Node and the agent with which the Mobile Node is registering.” More particularly, the public key is not obtained by the mobile computer in a Mobile IP message such as a registration reply message. It is also important to note that the key is not to be shared by the Mobile Node and the agent with which the Mobile Node is registering (its Home Agent), but rather by the mobile computer and the gateway (e.g., element 4b). In other words, the mobile computer is not registering with the gateway. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Inoue fails to anticipate claims 1-4, 44-46, 52, 67-69 and 77-79.

The dependent claims depend from one of the independent claims and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons. However, the dependent claims recite additional limitations that further distinguish them from Inoue. The additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed, as the above discussed limitations are clearly sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited reference. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of the claims under 35 USC §102.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 USC §102(E)

The Examiner has also rejected claims 37-38, and 73-75 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Chowdhury, U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0114323, ('Chowdhury' hereinafter). This rejection is fully traversed below.

In view of the claim amendments, Applicant respectfully submits that Chowdhury fails to anticipate the independent claims. More particularly, while Chowdhury relates to the dynamic assignment of a Home Agent, Chowdhury fails to disclose or suggest obtaining a key to be shared between the Mobile Node and the assigned Home Agent. The dependent claims depend from one of the independent claims and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons. However, the dependent claims recite additional limitations that further distinguish them from Chowdhury. The additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed, as the above discussed limitations are clearly sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited reference. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of the claims under 35 USC §102.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 USC §103

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 42, 64-65, 76 and 80-82 under 35 USC §103 under Inoue in view of Agraharam et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,407,988, ('Agraharam' hereinafter). This rejection is fully traversed below.

Applicant respectfully asserts that Agraharam fails to cure the deficiencies of the primary reference as set forth above. As a result, the combination of the cited references would fail to achieve the desired result. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 42, 64-65, 76 and 80-82 under Inoue in view of Agraharam.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 5, 12, 18-27, 34, 36, 47, 48, 53, 59-63 and 70-72 under 35 USC §103 under Inoue in view of Chowdhury. This rejection is fully traversed below.

While Chowdhury does relate to dynamically assigning a Home Agent, Chowdhury fails to cure the deficiencies of Inoue as set forth above. As a result, the combination of the cited references would fail to achieve the desired result. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 5, 12, 18-27, 34, 36, 47, 48, 53, 59-63 and 70-72 under Inoue in view of Chowdhury.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 39-41 under 35 USC §103 under Chowdhury in view of Inoue. This rejection is fully traversed below.

While Chowdhury does relate to dynamically assigning a Home Agent, Inoue fails to disclose or suggest the claim features as the Examiner suggests. More particularly, Inoue fails to disclose or suggest sending a Mobile IP registration reply that includes a key to be shared by the Mobile Node and the Home Agent that has been assigned to the Mobile Node, thereby enabling the Mobile Node to subsequently register directly with the Home Agent that has been assigned to the Mobile Node. As a result, the combination of the cited references would fail to achieve the desired result. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 39-41 (now claims 37, 40 and 41) under Chowdhury in view of Inoue.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 6, 13-16, 32-33, and 54-57 under 35 USC §103 under Inoue in view of Faccin et al, Publication No. 2002/0114469, ('Faccin' hereinafter). This rejection is fully traversed below.

Faccin fails to cure the deficiencies of Inoue, as set forth above. More particularly, Inoue fails to disclose or suggest sending a Mobile IP registration reply that includes a key to be shared by the Mobile Node and the Home Agent with which the Mobile Node is registering. In addition, Applicant was unable to find a reference to a RADIUS access accept packet including two keys in paragraph [0009] cited by the Examiner. As a result, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of the cited references would fail to achieve the desired result. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 6, 13-16, 32-33, and 54-57 under Inoue in view of Faccin.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claim 43 under 35 USC §103 under Inoue in view of Agraharam and further in view of Chowdhury. This rejection is fully traversed below.

Applicant respectfully asserts that Agraharam and Chowdhury fails to cure the deficiencies of the primary reference as set forth above. As a result, the combination of the cited references would fail to achieve the desired result. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 43.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 7-11, 17, 49-51 and 58 under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Inoue in view of Rai et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,421,714, ('Rai' hereinafter). This rejection is fully traversed below.

While Rai discusses agent advertisements, Rai fails to cure the deficiencies of the primary reference, as set forth above. Moreover, the combination of the cited references would fail to achieve the desired result. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of the cited references fails to teach or suggest the invention of claims 7-11, 17, 49-51 and 58.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 28-31 under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Inoue in view of Chowdhury and further in view of Rai. This rejection is fully traversed below.

Both Chowdhury and Rai fail to cure the deficiencies of the primary reference, as set forth above. Thus, the combination of the cited references would fail to achieve the desired result. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of the cited references fails to teach or suggest the invention of claims 28-31.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claim 66 under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Inoue in view of Agraharam and further in view of Rai. This rejection is fully traversed below.

Both Agraharam and Rai fail to cure the deficiencies of the primary reference, as set forth above. Thus, the combination of the cited references would fail to achieve the desired

result. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of the cited references fails to teach or suggest the invention of claim 66.

SUMMARY

If there are any issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through either a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Applicants hereby petition for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0388 (Order No. CISCP243).

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER, WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

Elise R. Heilbrunn
Reg. No. 42,649



P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250

Tel: (510) 663-1100